

1 GEOFFREY A. HANSEN  
2 Acting Federal Public Defender  
3 DEJAN M. GANTAR  
4 Assistant Federal Public Defender  
5 DANIEL P. BLANK  
6 Senior Litigator  
7 55 S. Market Street, Suite 820  
8 San Jose, CA 95113  
Telephone: (408) 291-7753  
Facsimile: (408) 291-7399  
Dejan\_Gantar@fd.org  
Daniel\_Blank@fd.org

9 Counsel for Defendant JUAN ROCHA a.k.a. PABLO NUÑEZ

10  
11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14  
15 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

16  
17 JUAN ROCHA a.k.a. PABLO NUÑEZ,

Defendant.

18 Case No. CR 19-00382 EJD

19 DEFENDANT'S PROPOSED THEORY  
OF DEFENSE INSTRUCTION

20 Honorable Edward J. Davila

21  
22 Defendant Juan Rocha a.k.a. Pablo Nuñez, by and through his counsel, submits the  
following theory of defense jury instruction. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 30,  
23 Mr. Rocha/Nuñez requests the Court to instruct the jury as set forth below.  
24

25 ////

26 ////

27 ////

28 DEF.'S PROPOSED THEORY OF DEFENSE INSTRUCTION

CR 19-00382 EJD

1  
2 Dated: March 16, 2021  
3

Respectfully submitted,

GEOFFREY A. HANSEN  
Acting Federal Public Defender

/S/  
5

DEJAN M. GANTAR  
Assistant Federal Public Defender

DANIEL P. BLANK  
Senior Litigator  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DEF.'S PROPOSED THEORY OF DEFENSE INSTRUCTION  
CR 19-00382 EJD

**Mr. Rocha/Nuñez's Theory of Defense Instruction**

1           Mr. Rocha/Nuñez contends that he is not guilty of making a false statement on a passport  
2 application, because the government has not proven all of the elements beyond a reasonable  
3 doubt. Specifically, Mr. Rocha/Nuñez contends that the government has not proven that he  
4 provided information in the 2016 passport application that he knew was false. Based on Mr.  
5 Rocha/Nuñez's mental health issues, and his history of using the name Pablo Anthony Nuñez,  
6 and the social security number ending in -4412, he believed that the information he provided in  
7 the passport application was true. Therefore, he did not know the information he provided was  
8 actually false.

9           The burden is on the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt each element of the  
10 offense. Mr. Rocha/Nuñez does not have to prove his innocence, nor does he bear the burden of  
11 having to prove any fact in this case. If the government fails to prove each and every element of  
12 the offense beyond a reasonable doubt as set forth in Count one, you must return a not guilty  
13 verdict.

14           A defendant is entitled to jury instructions related to a defense theory if there is "any foundation  
15 in the evidence" and the instruction is "supported by law." *United States v. Cortes*, 757 F.3d  
16 850, 857 (9th Cir. 2014) (internal citation and quotations omitted).

17           "[A] defendant is entitled to an instruction concerning his theory of the case if the theory is  
18 legally sound and evidence in the case makes it applicable, even if the evidence is weak,  
19 insufficient, inconsistent, or of doubtful credibility." *United States v. Washington*, 819 F.2d 221,  
20 225 (9th Cir. 1987), quoted in *Cortes*, 757 F.3d at 858.

21           DEF.'S PROPOSED THEORY OF DEFENSE INSTRUCTION

22           CR 19-00382 EJD